

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Office Action dated March 21, 2007. In response to the issues raised, we offer the following submissions and amendments. Also enclosed is a Terminal Disclaimer linking the term and ownership of any patent granted in the present application to that of US 7,086,718.

Amendments

The claims have been amended to correct the antecedent and grammatical errors identified by the Examiner. However, we have not amended claims 43 or 44 as neither claim contains the term “the chamber”.

The claims have also been amended to incorporate the features of claims 5, 21 and 36 into independent claims 1, 17 and 33. This amendment make claims 4, 20 and 35 redundant. In light of this, claims 4, 5, 20, 21, 35 and 36 have been cancelled.

Accordingly, the amendments do not add any new matter.

Specification

At Page 1, the Applicant has inserted a paragraph entitled “Cross-Reference to Related Applications”, as required (just above “Field of the Invention”). The Applicant submits that this amendment introduces no new matter.

Claims – 35USC§102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 17, 18, 20, 24, 33-35 and 39 stand rejected for lack of novelty in light of US 6,543,879 to Feinn et al.

Independent claims 1, 17 and 33 have been amended to incorporate the specific features of claims 5, 21 and 36.

This combination of features is not taught by Feinn and hence it fails to anticipate independent claims 1, 17 or 33. It follows that dependent claims 2, 4, 8, 18, 20, 24, 34, 35 and 39 are also novel.

Claims – 35USC§103

Claims 3, 7, 10-12, 19, 23, 26-28, 38 and 41-43 are rejected as obvious in light of Feinn, in view of US 6,019,457 to Silverbrook.

As discussed above, Feinn does not teach a printhead with the nozzle density defined in amended claims 1, 17 or 33. Silverbrook is similarly silent as to any printheads with nozzles densities above 40,000 nozzles per square cm of substrate surface.

Accordingly, the citations do not support a §103 rejection of these claims.

Claims 6, 9, 16, 22, 25, 32, 37, 40 and 47 are rejected as obvious in light of Feinn, in view of US 5,706,041 to Kubby et al.

Kubby also fails to teach a printhead with nozzles densities above 40,000 nozzles per square cm of substrate surface.

Accordingly, the citations do not support a §103 rejection of these claims.

Claims 13, 29 and 44 are rejected as obvious in light of Feinn, in view of US 4,965,594 to Komuro.

Komuro also fails to teach a printhead with nozzles densities above 40,000 nozzles per square cm of substrate surface.

Accordingly, the citations do not support a §103 rejection of these claims.

Claims 14, 30 and 45 are rejected as obvious in light of Feinn, in view of The Fabrication and Reliability Testing of Ti/TiN Heaters (DeMoor).

The DeMoor paper does not describe a printhead with nozzles densities above 40,000 nozzles per square cm of substrate surface.

Accordingly, the citations do not support a §103 rejection of these claims.

Claims 15, 31 and 46 are rejected as obvious in light of Feinn, in view of US 5,969,005 to Yamashita et al.

As with the other cited references, Komuro also fails to teach a printhead with nozzles densities above 40,000 nozzles per square cm of substrate surface.

Accordingly, the citations do not support a §103 rejection of these claims.

Non-Statutory Double Patenting

The enclosed Terminal Disclaimer prevents any unjustified extension of exclusive rights or harassment from multiple assignees.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejections have been successfully traversed and the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



Kia Silverbrook

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd

393 Darling Street

Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762